



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT
OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY
ISSUE NO. 4
OCTOBER 1997

In this issue . . .

Record Keeping and Disposal	2
Misconception: The BOP is from Mars, Psychologists are from Venus	4
Changes Made by SB 523 to the Administrative Procedure Act	6
Getting Better All the Time	12
What IS a Registered Psychologist?	13
What Do Other States Require for Licensure as a Psychologist? ...	13
Licensure Requirements for U.S. States, Canadian Provinces ..	14
April 1997 Written Exam Stats ...	17
June 1997 Oral Exam Stats	18
BOP Publications	19
Put BOP's Phone System to Work for You	19
1998 Board Meeting & Exam Calendar	20

Message from the Chairperson

Bruce W. Ebert, PhD, JD

This year has been one of the busiest on record for the Board of Psychology. The Board is preparing the final draft of its report to the legislature for compliance with the Sunset Review mandate. As a part of this process, we have gathered data in response to questions written by the staff of the Joint Legislative Sunset Review Committee. One of the many intriguing statistics obtained in this process is the number of times the Board has overturned or "non-adopted" a decision proposed by an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). An ALJ is the person who conducts hearings when a licensee contests charges against him/her in accordance with the California Administrative Procedures Act. All boards have the authority to overturn an ALJ's proposed decision. The Board of Psychology, however, is the only board that has developed and imposed upon itself strict guidelines to be followed when non-adopting a decision proposed by an ALJ. In the past

four years the Board has overturned two, five, five, and two proposed decisions respectively. The Sunset Review Report is providing data which clearly indicates that the Board is following its primary mandate to protect the public and is doing so with appropriate due process.

In addition to the Sunset Review Report, the Board has been working with the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) to create an Integrated Consumer Protection System which is a state-of-the-art interactive computer system automating all records, data and reports for each board within the Department. This is a massive project because it involves most of the DCA boards and bureaus. Our goal is the integration and automation of the entire system of credentials, applications, and disciplinary actions.

The Board has devoted a significant

(Continued on page 5)

Record Keeping

Bruce W. Ebert, PhD, JD

The article "Record Keeping and Disposal," beginning on page two of this issue, is reprinted with the permission of the California Psychological Association - Division I. Because of the importance of this topic and the excellence of the article, the BOP obtained permission from CPA to reprint it in the *BOP Update*. One correction to be noted, the record-keeping statute referred to in the article as Health and Safety Code Section 1795 has been changed to Health and Safety Code Section 123100.

In current practice, all psychologists should be aware that **good record keeping is mandatory**. All psychologists must keep accurate records of service provided to consumers, including the date of service, nature of activities performed, a description of any relevant information provided by the

client, the amount of time spent with a client, notation of the client's mental status, any significant events that occur during the service, an assessment of the client at least in general terms for each session, and a plan of action. The 1992 Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct [47(12) American Psychologist 1597, (1992)] provides direct guidance and rules of record keeping. Every psychologist should carefully review Standards 1.23, 1.24, and 1.25 of the code. Notwithstanding assertions to the contrary, these are enforceable standards on record keeping for psychologists. Although the Record Keeping Guidelines published by APA in 1993 [48(9) American Psychologist 984,

(Continued on page 11)



Record Keeping and Disposal

Ethics

The record keeping guidelines adopted by the American Psychological Association (APA) are based on the APA Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (APA, 1992). These guidelines are aspirational, and professional judgment must be used in specific applications.

Relevant sections in the ethics principles (1992) guide psychologists to:

- Maintain appropriate confidentiality in creating, storing, accessing, transferring, and disposing of records under their control, whether these are written, automated, or in any other medium; maintain and dispose of records in accordance with law (5.04);
- Make plans in advance so that confidentiality of records and data is protected in the event of the psychologist's death, incapacity, or withdrawal from the position or practice (5.09);
- Take reasonable and lawful steps so that records and data remain available to the extent needed to serve the best interests of individual or organizational clients, research participants, or appropriate others (5.10);
- Not withdraw records under their control that are requested and immediately needed for a client's treatment solely because payment has not been received, except as otherwise provided by law (5.11);
- Inform research participants of their anticipated sharing or further use of personally identifiable research data and of the possibility of unanticipated future uses.

Principles and purpose

The most important reason for maintaining records is to benefit the client.

Records allow a psychologist to document and review the delivery of psychological services. Record keeping may also serve institutional, financial, and legal purposes (e.g., state requirement for maintenance of records; a requirement for receipt of third-party payment; protection from professional liability).

While the degree of documentation may be left to the individual psychologist's judgment, to some extent, both the standard of care and various laws and regulations require that notes be taken and records be kept. From this vantage point, an individual psychologist who does not take notes because of a philosophical bias against note-taking can be

"The most important reason for maintaining records is to benefit the client."

viewed to operate in ways which can result in significant ethical, administrative (i.e., discipline by the Board of Psychology), and legal consequences (professional liability).

The following guidelines assume that the record is free from disclosure. For situations in which records need to be released, please refer to other titles in the EXPERTISE series.

What and how to write records

The nature and extent of the record will vary depending upon the type and purpose of psychological services. Content of records minimally includes (a) identifying data, (b) dates of services, (c) types of services, (d) fees, (e) any assessment, plan for intervention,

consultation, summary reports, and/or testing reports and supporting data as may be appropriate, and (f) any release of information obtained. More comprehensive records may include intake information, history (psychosexual/developmental), evaluations (mental status examination, psychological test findings, etc.), diagnosis, specific treatment objectives and methods used to reach these goals, progress notes, termination summary, supervision/consultation notes, medication record (current/historical), correspondence, billing record, and legal documents (i.e., release of information).

Records should be maintained in sufficient detail for (a) continuity in the event that another psychologist takes over delivery of services and (b) regulatory and administrative review of psychological service delivery.

It is assumed that chart notes will be written in a professional, objective, and nonpejorative manner. One useful approach is to create records with the expectation that the client or others may someday read them, and to use the least emotionally charged, yet accurate, terms. In determining what should be included in charts, Haas and Malouf recommend that the clinician consider his or her potential "audiences" for whom the charts are being written, and that only information necessary to meet such needs be included in a client's chart.

Potential audiences can be the legal system (courts and attorneys), third-party payers, and the clinician and other practitioners.

As a defense against a malpractice suit, records can show the clinician's competency in conceptualizing the case and in

(Continued on page 3)



Record Keeping and Disposal

(Continued from page 2)

devising a treatment plan, considerations of issues of suicide risk, potential for physical aggressiveness, and possible medical components of symptoms. A typical record that may be requested by an insurance company includes date of service, type of service, charges, payments, and diagnosis of the disorder treated.

Securing records

All practitioners have an obligation to maintain their records in a way that protects the client's confidentiality. Keeping in mind that the psychologist bears the ultimate responsibility for the action of his or her staff, the practitioner needs to provide his/her staff training, supervision, and proper procedures in safeguarding confidentiality of records and responsible record keeping.

Special instances need to be kept in mind, such as taking and securing messages via telephone answering machine, fax machine, or computer. For example, telephone answering and fax machines should be carefully monitored and made accessible only to appropriate staff.

Disposal of records

In principle, the practitioner needs to maintain records as long as there is a chance that they will be needed (e.g., financial reasons, such as documentation for an IRS audit; continuity of care; legal situations in future). One practical recommendation is to keep records for at least seven years from the termination of treatment; this corresponds with the length of time that the IRS can audit a tax return. The American Psychological Association recommends that the full record be retained intact for three years

after completion of planned services or after the last date of contact with the consumer (whichever is later), and that the full record or a summary of the record be maintained for an additional 12 years. (Note: In view of another [1981] guideline that states that the full record for counseling psychologists be retained for four years, a conservative approach would recommend that all psychologists retain the full record for four years and a summary of the record for an additional 12 years.) If the client is a minor, the record period is extended until three years after the age of majority. The record may be disposed of no sooner than 15 years after completion of planned services or after the date of the last contact, whichever is later.

In California, the Health and Safety Code (Section 1795.26) requires records to be maintained for a minimum of seven years following the discharge of a client from certain clinics, including nonprofit psychological clinics (except in the case of minors where the records shall be kept at least one year after the minor has reached the age of 18, but in no case less than seven years). Section 1795.20 of the Health and Safety Code permits mental health professionals to provide a client with a summary instead of a copy of the records if certain conditions are met.

Disposing of records should be done in a safe, effective manner. Any information with a client's name should be burned, shredded, or in some other way made unintelligible.

When outdated information needs to be disclosed, particularly when such disclosure may cause adverse effects, the psychologist should note its outdated nature and limited utility.

References

- American Psychological Association (1993). *Record Keeping Guidelines*. Drafted by the Committee on Professional Practice & Standards. A committee of the Board of Professional Affairs. Adopted by the Council of Representatives, February 1993.
- American Psychological Association (1992). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1597-1611.
- American Psychologist (1981). *Specialty Guidelines for Delivery of Services*, June, 1981, Vol. 36, No. 6, 640-681.
- Haas, L.J., & Malouf, J.L. (1989). *Keeping Up the Good Work: A Practitioner's Guide to Mental Health Ethics*. Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource Exchange, Inc.
- Stott, R.L. (1995). *Laws, Ethics, and Standards: Guidelines and Legal Procedures Relating to the Practice of Psychology in California*. Seventh Edition. Copyrighted by California Psychological Association. ♠

Did you know?

*Did you know that the address listed on your BOP Update mailing label is your address of record? This is the address given to the public upon request, and where your license renewal forms are sent. If you wish to change this address, you must send a **written** request to the Board office in Sacramento. The Board recommends that you not use your residence address as your address of record for obvious reasons.*



Misconception: The BOP is from Mars, Psychologists are from Venus

Pamela Harmell, PhD

The Board of Psychology is proud to present the first outside contribution to the BOP Update. Pamela Harmell, PhD, practices clinical psychology in Los Angeles. She is a representative of the Board of Directors of the Los Angeles County Psychological Association and is a member of that association's Ethics Committee. The following is Dr. Harmell's contribution.

Many psychologists are confused about the difference between laws and ethics, ethics committees, civil suits, criminal allegations and how these relate to the Board of Psychology (BOP). These topics become merged into one terrifying mass unless we understand and integrate the functions of each domain.

Simply put, California laws are mandatory "have to do" codes of conduct established by legislation, such as Penal, Family and Civil Codes. Professional ethics are "ought to" situations based upon ideal behavior. The American Psychological Association (APA) *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* is the ultimate measure of standard of care in our profession, with both aspirational goals and enforceable rules (see introduction to APA Code).

Standard of care is the minimum below which a clinician may not fall. Note that this is not the "ideal" action to take, but what any other clinician would do at the very least. The APA ethics code is considered the standard of care for psychologists throughout the United States and is often used in court to demonstrate appropriate patient care.

We often complain that laws, ethics codes, and BOP regulations are written to be deliberately vague and therefore are difficult to follow. However, each situation is a separate and different case requiring intense scrutiny and caution prior to action. Therefore, this inherent vagueness is actually beneficial to psychologists, in that the facts can be interpreted for each situation.

There are four mechanisms holding us accountable for our professional behavior: professional ethics committees, state licensing boards (BOP), civil suits of malpractice, and criminal allegations of malpractice. Although there are local ethics committees (for example, the Los Angeles County Psychological Association, LACPA) made up of volunteer psychologists, only the CPA and APA can investigate and adjudicate violations of the ethics code. Ethics committees are separate and distinct from disciplinary action or investigation by a licensing board for unprofessional conduct.

The California state licensing board (BOP) is organized under the Department of Consumer Affairs and establishes requirements for education, licensure, and disciplinary action when necessary. To the uninformed, any communication from the BOP can precipitate a panic attack. It has been a time-honored tradition to dread and fear the Board as "the enemy," and this tradition has been passed down like a legend from generation to generation. As a representative of LACPA's Board of Directors and a member of LACPA's ethics committee, I have attended numerous BOP meetings (open to the public) and become fairly familiar with the way it works. My experience has been both satisfying and educational. I have always been thoroughly heard, treated with utmost respect, and

made to feel completely welcome. At breaks in the meetings, Board members have conversed with me about a number of topics and are approachable and available. This is a devoted and hard-working group of

people who must consider the best interests of the public while dealing with the Legislature, the Governor, and thousands of psychologists.

The third mechanism holding psychologists accountable for our actions is civil suits of malpractice beginning with a private dispute against a psychologist. For example, if a

patient claims sexual exploitation by a therapist, the patient may file a civil suit of malpractice. Additionally, a psychologist may be charged with a violation of statutory law (largely state law) or federal law which begins with a reported crime. The crime is investigated by representatives of the state ("the government," "the state," or "the people") and is generally settled in court. In essence, the bad news is a psychologist (1) may have to demonstrate to the ethics committee that he or she practiced within the accepted standard of care, (2) may be investigated by the BOP for license violations, (3) may have to defend against a civil suit, and (4) may have to defend against criminal allegations.

GOOD NEWS! Most of us will never have an occasion to deal with any of these bodies, except to review our ethics codes and renew our licenses. Becoming familiar with local and state ethics committees, sending \$4.00 to the BOP for the official laws and regulations relating to the practice of psychology, taking continuing education in ethical issues, and keeping the APA Code handy are methods by which we continually protect ourselves from trouble. Finally, the



(Continued on page 5)



Message From the Chairperson

(Continued from page 1)

amount of time to addressing concerns and issues raised by the California Psychological Association (CPA). CPA President Steven Bucky, Ph.D., has provided the BOP with a list of sixteen areas of concern and requested explanations and clarifications of the disciplinary process. The list includes such areas as complaints, investigation procedures, the Administrative Procedures Act, administrative hearings, selection and training of experts for the Board, screening and evaluation of complaints against psychologists, the effect of stipulated settlements, effects of various terms and conditions imposed following disciplinary actions, and ethical guidelines of the American Psychological Association as they apply to Board members. The Board is working diligently on the response to

CPA. The final report will be printed in the *California Psychologist* and will hopefully result in a better understanding of the mission of the Board of Psychology and the laws that strictly govern the means by which the Board accomplishes this mission.

The BOP was one of the first boards in the DCA to develop and make operational an internet website. The web page address is www.dca.ca.gov/psych. The site contains a calendar of events, information about the administrative complaint process, disciplinary actions, licensing information, links to the laws and regulations governing the practice of psychology in California, and links to other web pages such as the APA's and CPA's. This website is part of the BOP's educational plan to reach out to all consumers and psychologists in the state.

The Board has been very active in the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB). The Board's executive officer, Tom O'Connor, has been involved in the ASPPB Examination Development Committee which has been working on the computerization of the administration of the Examination of Professional Practice in Psychology. Tom has also been appointed by ASPPB to its Committee on Education and Training for Credentialing. This committee's charge is to work toward the development of a national oral examination for psychology licensing, and the committee is looking closely at the oral examination developed by the California BOP to use as a model. Both Tom and I have given presentations at ASPPB meetings on a variety of topics, including examinations, litigation strategies, and the future of regulation in psychology. Through my work with ASPPB, I have

been asked to be a part of the faculty for the upcoming Attorney Certification Course in Licensing Law offered by the Federation of Regulatory Boards.

Finally, the California Board of Psychology was awarded the 1997 President's Award by ASPPB in recognition of outstanding contributions to the regulation of psychology. We are honored to receive this award, which has been presented to a regulatory board on only one other occasion. I commend the staff and the Board members for this major national achievement. The California Board of Psychology has indeed proven itself to be the international leader in innovations in the regulation of the profession of psychology.

As a member of the profession of psychology, I appreciate all of the great work psychologists are doing in dealing with individuals who are suffering from a variety of psychological conditions. The practice of psychology is so diverse that it covers a very wide range of services including industrial/organizational consulting, prevention, media work, health psychology, aerospace consulting, psychometrics, neuropsychology, treatment of mental disorders, research, and human factors work. Psychology is unique in that it is a science which forms the base for practical applications in the field. I hope that the over 13,000 psychologists practicing in this state recognize that they are part of something very special: the largest, most well-trained group of mental health specialists in the country. ♠

Bruce W. Ebert

Misconception

(Continued from page 4)

BOP is not our adversary—it is our regulatory body and is available to us for advice and answers. The more we know about the ethics codes, standard of care, and regulations of the BOP, the lesser the chance of disciplinary action.

References

- Caudill, O. & Pope, K. (1995). *Law & Mental Health Professional—California*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Stromberg, C. et al (1988). *The Psychologist's Legal Handbook*. Washington DC: The Council for the National Register of Health Service Providers in Psychology.
- American Psychological Association (1992). *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association. ♠



Changes Made by SB 523 to the Administrative Procedure Act

Senate Bill 523 substantially revised the Administrative Procedure Act as it governs administrative disciplinary actions taken against professional and vocational licenses. The bill was sponsored by the California Law Revision Commission, authored by Senator Quentin Kopp, and signed into law by Governor Wilson; it became Chapter 938 of the Statutes of 1995. Although it was enacted in 1995, many of its provisions did not become effective until July 1, 1997. (The Administrative Procedure Act is found in Part 1 [commencing with section 11370] of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.) This document will summarize many of the changes made by SB 523. The summary is divided into the following subject matter areas: new provisions of significant interest, pre-hearing changes, hearing flexibility, new authority given to Administrative Law Judges (ALJs), and hearing changes, post-hearing changes, and declaratory decisions. All statutory references below are to the Government Code.

New Provisions of Significant Interest

1. **Administrative Adjudication Bill of Rights**—SB 523 contains a "Bill of Rights" which must be followed by licensing boards conducting administrative hearings to deny, suspend, or revoke licenses (Section 11425.10). A statement of issues is filed to deny a license; an accusation is filed to suspend or revoke a license. The Bill of Rights provides that:

(a) The person against whom an action is taken must be given notice and an opportunity to be heard and to present and rebut evidence.

(b) Upon request, a copy of the provisions governing the action must be made available to the person against whom the action is taken.

(c) The hearing must be open to public observation.

(d) The adjudicative function must be separated from the investigative, prosecutorial, and advocacy functions within the board.

(e) The presiding officer is subject to disqualification for bias, prejudice, or conflict of interest.

(f) The decision must be in writing, be based on the record, and include the factual and legal basis for the decision.

(g) A decision may not be relied upon as a precedent unless it has been appropriately designated as a precedential decision.

(h) *Ex parte* communications are restricted as provided in statute.

(i) Language assistance must be made available as specified.

2. **Disciplinary Guidelines**—On and after July 1, 1997, an administrative disciplinary decision may not be based upon a guideline that has not been formally adopted as a regulation (Section 11425.50(e)). The Board of Psychology *Disciplinary Guidelines* were adopted as a regulation and approved by the Office of Administrative Law on March 7, 1997.

3. **Precedential Decisions**—SB 523 allows a board to designate an administrative disciplinary decision, or a portion of a decision, as precedential. The board may designate decisions issued before, on, or after July 1, 1997 (Section 11425.60). These decisions may be relied upon as precedent with

respect to subsequent similar issues and situations.

To designate decisions as precedential, the board must maintain an index of the decisions, update the index annually if any new decisions have been designated, make the index available to the public by subscription, and annually publicize its availability in the *California Regulatory Notice Register*.

Prehearing Changes

1. A provision is added to the law stating that there can be no **stipulation** without the filing of a statement of issues or an accusation (Section 11415.60).
2. A board is authorized to adopt a regulation to allow third-party **intervention** into its disciplinary actions. At this time, the Board of Psychology does not contemplate adopting such a regulation. Without such a regulation, third parties may not intervene (Section 11440.50).
3. Under previous law, **subpoenas** could be issued only by the board or an ALJ. SB 523 allows the board, the ALJ at the request of a party, or attorneys for the parties to issue subpoenas (Sections 11450.05-11450.50).
4. Under previous law, **discovery** issues had to be resolved by the civil courts. This bill allows ALJs to resolve discovery issues (Section 11507.7).
5. ALJs are given the authority to grant a petition for a **deposition**. Under previous law, the authority for depositions was extremely limited (Section 11511).

(Continued on page 7)



Changes Made by SB 523

(Continued from page 6)

6. SB 523 allows the ALJ to change **venue**, which is the site of the hearing. This was not authorized under previous law (Section 11508).

Hearing Flexibility

1. Upon their own motion, or on a party's motion, ALJs are authorized to **consolidate cases** that are brought by several licensing boards against a person who holds licenses from those boards (Section 11508).
2. SB 523 authorizes a board, upon consent of all parties, to provide for **alternative dispute resolution**, such as mediation, or binding or nonbinding arbitration. At this time, the Board of Psychology does not contemplate using this process (Sections 11420.10-11420.30).
3. In certain cases, SB 523 allows **hearings to be conducted by electronic means** (Section 11440.30).
4. SB 523 allows for **informal hearings** in specified situations (Sections 11445.10-11445.60).
5. **Hearsay evidence** may supplement or explain other evidence. If there is a timely objection, it can support a finding only if the hearsay evidence would be admissible in a civil action. An objection is timely if made before submission of the case or on reconsideration (Section 11513(d)).

New Authority for ALJs and Hearing Changes

ALJs may:

1. **Resolve discovery issues** as noted above. Previously they had to be resolved by the court (Section 11507.7).
2. **Order attendance** at settlement conferences (Section 11511.7).

3. **Exclude the offer of evidence** if the ALJ determines that the probative value of the evidence is substantially outweighed by the time to be consumed to present the evidence (Section 11513(f)).
4. **Order a party and/or his or her attorney to pay reasonable expenses** incurred by another party as a result of bad faith actions or tactics that are frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay (Section 11455.30).
5. **Certify the facts that justify a citation for contempt** against a party and/or his or her attorney (Sections 11455.10-11455.20).

Posthearing Changes

1. ALJs will continue to submit a proposed decision to the board. The **board retains the authority to adopt or non-adopt the decision, or adopt the factual findings but reduce the penalty** (Section 11517). These provisions in the law were not changed.
2. SB 523 would allow the board to **review an ALJ's exclusion of evidence** in the same manner and to the same extent that it reviews the ALJ's proposed decision (Section 11512(b)).
3. SB 523 authorizes the board to **correct minor technical errors** in a proposed decision. Any such corrections may not affect the factual or legal basis of the decision (Section 11517(b)(3)).
4. The bill allows parties to petition the board to **correct a mistake or clerical error** (Section 11518.5).
5. Previous law limited the ordering of **restitution** to cases in which a breach of contract occurred. SB 523 removes

the reference to breach of contract, thus allowing restitution in a broader category of cases (Section 11519(d)).

6. A **non-party may not be required to comply with a decision unless** the decision has been made available for public inspection and copying, or the non-party has actual knowledge of the decision (Section 11519(h)).
7. If the factual basis for a decision includes a determination based substantially on the **credibility of a witness**, the determination must identify any specific evidence of the observed demeanor, manner, or attitude of the witness that supports the determination, and on judicial review the court must give great weight to the determination (Section 11425.50(b)).

Declaratory Decisions

SB 523 contains a provision authorizing state agencies to issue declaratory decisions. A party would ask the agency the applicability of its laws to specific facts presented. It is within the sound discretion of the agency whether it wishes to issue declaratory decisions. The Office of Administrative Hearings is developing administrative regulations to implement the declaratory decision process.

Conclusion

The foregoing is only a brief description of the changes made to the Administrative Procedure Act by SB 523 of the Statutes of 1995. For more complete information, you may wish to consult the actual language of the act, contained in the Government Code provisions noted in the introductory paragraph of this article. ♠



Disciplinary Actions

SEPTEMBER 30, 1996-AUGUST 30, 1997

NOTICE: The following decisions become operative on the effective date, except in situations where the licensee obtains a court-ordered stay. This may occur after the publication of this newsletter. For updated information on stay orders and appeals, you may telephone (916) 263-0321 and ask for the Board's Enforcement Technician. To order copies of these decisions and other documents, send your written request, including the name and license number of the licensee, to the attention of the Enforcement Program at the Board's offices in Sacramento.

**Ambar, Zvia, Ph.D. (PSB 17171)
Beverly Hills, CA**

B&P Code §§480(a)(1), 490, 2960 (a)(n), 2963. Admits to conviction for making a false statement on a loan application. Stipulated Decision effective April 14, 1997. Psychological assistant registration revoked, stayed, 5 years' probation. Probation remains in effect even if respondent meets qualifications for licensure in the future and becomes licensed.

**Bachelor, Barry G., Ph.D. (PSY 8467)
Cerritos, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective August 28, 1997. License surrender.

**Brebion, Luc Louis, Ph.D. (PSY 9049)
Berkeley, CA**

Neither admits nor denies charges of referring two patients to a palm reader and aiding and abetting the unlicensed practice of psychology. Stipulated Decision effective August 8, 1997. Must successfully pass oral licensing examination and two educational courses, then Accusation will be withdrawn.

**Brito, William (PSB 25101; RPS 92091;
RPS 97017) San Rafael, CA**

B&P Code §§480(a)(c), 2903, 2960(a)(b)(k)(n). Convicted of loitering while under the influence of alcohol. Admitted to using illegal drugs and practicing psychology without a license. Stipulated Decision effective November 20, 1996. Granted 5-year probationary psychological assistant registration and a two-year probationary registration as a registered psychologist.

**Bugental, Robert, Ph.D. (PSY 3480)
Los Angeles, CA**

Neither admits nor denies the charges of aiding and abetting unlicensed practice of psychology by allowing prospective psychological assistants to work unregistered. Stipulated Decision effective July 19, 1997. Must successfully pass written supervisorial exam and accept issuance of cite and fine, then Accusation will be withdrawn.

**Carrillo, Ricardo A., Ph.D. (PSY 11696)
San Mateo, CA**

B&P Code §2960(a)(b). Admits to charges that, during a substance abuse relapse in 1993, he committed petty theft on five separate occasions - each resulting in a conviction. Stipulated Decision effective July 18, 1997. License revoked, stayed, 5 years' probation.

**Carroll, Frank T., Ph.D. (PSY 4649)
Whittier, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective November 3, 1996. License surrender.

**Cheney, John H., Ph.D. (PSY 6928)
Redlands, CA**

B&P Code §§2960(a)(b)(i)(k), 822. Convicted of reckless starting of fires and driving. Illegally used drugs, narcotics and alcohol and treated patients while impaired. Mental illness. Decision effective November 20, 1996. Revoked.

Explanation of Disciplinary Language

Revoked—The license is cancelled, voided, annulled, rescinded. The right to practice is ended.

Revoked, stayed, probation—“Stayed” means the revocation is postponed, put off. Professional practice may continue so long as the licensee complies with specific probationary terms and conditions. Violation of probation may result in the revocation that was postponed.

Suspension—The licensee is prohibited from practicing for a specific period of time.

Gross negligence—An extreme departure from the standard of practice.

Default decision—Licensee fails to respond to Accusation by filing a Notice of Defense, or fails to appear at administrative hearing.

License surrender—Resignation “under a cloud.” While charges are still pending, the licensee turns in the license - subject to acceptance by the board. The right to practice is ended.

Effective decision date—The date the disciplinary decision goes into operation.

**Christian, Kenneth W., Ph.D.
(PSY 4901) Lafayette, CA**

Neither admits nor denies charges of referring a patient to a palm reader and aiding and abetting the unlicensed practice of psychology. Stipulated Decision effective August 8, 1997. Must

(Continued on page 9)



Disciplinary Actions

(Continued from page 8)

successfully pass oral licensing examination and two educational courses, then Accusation will be withdrawn.

**Demos, George D., Ph.D. (PSY 534)
Long Beach, CA**

B&P Code §§2960(a)(g)(n), 490. 1995 conviction for procuring public aid by misrepresentation. Conspired with others to defraud Los Angeles County and the Social Security program. Decision effective June 27, 1997. License revoked, stayed, 60-day suspension, 5 years' probation. *Order stayed by Superior Court on June 26, 1997.*

**Detrick, Douglas, Ph.D. (PSY 5105)
San Francisco, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective January 15, 1997. License surrender.

**Easton, Freddie, Ph.D. (PSY 7340)
Phoenix, AZ**

B&P Code §§2960(a)(i)(k). 1991 arrest for spousal abuse which led to a conviction for resisting arrest. 1993 arrest for making threats to ex-wife which led to conviction for disturbing the peace. Default Decision effective May 23, 1997. License revoked.

**Fiore, Edith, Ph.D. (PSY 4144)
Saratoga, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective August 10, 1997. License Surrender.

**Grey, David Francis, Ph.D. (PSY 3678)
Ventura, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective June 21, 1997. License surrender.

**Gudowski, Richard M., Ph.D.
(PSY 11646) Newport Beach, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective August 15, 1997. License Surrender.

**Hendrick, William, Ph.D. (PSB 21363)
Riverside, CA**

B&P Code §§2960(i)(j)(r). Admits to charges of gross negligence and repeated negligent acts in that respondent spent an inordinate amount of time discussing his

personal problems and engaging in inappropriate language and conduct during therapy sessions. Stipulated Decision effective July 19, 1997. Psychological Assistant Registration revoked.

**Holt, Gary, Ph.D.
Marina Del Rey, CA**

B&P Code §§2960(a)(m)(n), 480(a). Convicted in the state of Illinois for mail fraud. Fraudulently billed the Department of Public Aid in Illinois for \$440,445.00. Stipulated Decision effective January 18, 1997. Application denied.

**James, Edward V., Ph.D. (PSY 2128)
Rancho Mirage, CA**

B&P Code §2960 (j). Admits to gross negligence by discussing his psychological assistant's performance and other matters with the psychological assistant in front of clients during a therapy session. Stipulated Decision effective June 11, 1997. License revoked.

**Johnson, Mark A., Ph.D. (PSY 6582)
San Clemente, CA**

B&P Code §2960(j). Gross negligence in failing to accurately use and interpret two psychology tests which led to using an inappropriate therapy technique that resulted in patient harm. Stipulated Decision effective November 2, 1996. License revoked, stayed, 5 years' probation.

**Johnston, Judith A., Ph.D. (PSY 10130)
Ramon, CA**

Respondent underwent educational review session and successfully completed a course in law and ethics. Stipulated Decision effective November 4, 1996. Accusation withdrawn.

**Kadjar, Shapoor, Ph.D. (PSY 3881)
Sepulveda, CA**

B&P Code §2960(k). Failed to complete the terms and conditions of probation. Default Decision effective November 24, 1996. License revoked.

Kayra-Stuart, Fortune, Ph.D. (PSY 9810) Albany, CA

No admissions to charges that respondent improperly supervised a psychological assistant. Stipulated Decision effective October 7, 1996. Completed a course in ethics and took at least 20 additional units of continuing education. Accusation withdrawn; public letter of reprimand issued.

**Kehoe, Dan G., Ph.D. (PSY 7035)
Laie, HI**

B&P Code §2960(a)(n). Convicted for grand theft and filing false and/or fraudulent Medi-Cal claims. Stipulated Decision effective November 3, 1996. License revoked, stayed, 3 years' probation.

**Lamach, Laverne (PSB 19864)
Walnut Creek, CA**

B&P Code §2960 (j). Admits to gross negligence in the treatment of two patients. Stipulated Decision effective May 24, 1997. Psychological assistant registration revoked, stayed, 7 years' probation.

(Continued on page 10)

Did you know?

*The law has changed regarding the cancellation date of delinquent licenses. Any license which expired and became delinquent any time after March 30, 1994 will be automatically cancelled three years from that expiration date, unless renewal and delinquent fees are paid prior to that time. Persons whose licenses become cancelled must **reapply** for licensure and meet all current requirements.*



Disciplinary Actions

(Continued from page 9)

Lerner, Albert, Ph.D. (PSY 5426)
Santa Rosa, CA

Stipulated Decision effective May 31, 1997. License surrender.

Lieberwitz, Michael, Ph.D. (PSY 8022)
Half Moon Bay, CA

Stipulated Decision effective January 1, 1997. License surrender.

Mahler, Clarence A., Ph.D. (PSY 226)
Chico, CA

Stipulated decision effective June 21, 1997. License surrender.

Mangan, Charles (PSB 24287)
Irvine, CA

B&P Code §2960(e)(i). Failure to disclose, on an application for registration as a psychological assistant, a 1981

conviction for crimes relating to credit card theft. Default Decision effective March 20, 1997. Registration revoked.

Marks, Clifford S., Ph.D. (PSY 3549)
Encinitas, CA

B&P Code §§2960(n), 822. Does not contest charges of mental illness and insurance fraud. Stipulated Decision effective April 24, 1997. 5 years' probation.

McQuade, Robert C., Ph.D. (PSY 5592)
Arroyo Grande, CA

Stipulated Decision effective November 22, 1996. License surrender.

Millsap, James E. (PSB 24942)
Irvine, CA

B&P Code §§2960(a), 480(a). Convictions for battery, possession of a drug without a prescription, and driving under the influence of alcohol. Stipulated Decision effective September 30, 1996. Psychological assistant registration to be issued, then revoked, stayed, 5 years' probation.

Nigl, Alfred J., Ph.D. (PSY 7048)
El Cajon, CA

Stipulated Decision effective November 22, 1996. License surrender.

Oziel, L. Jerome, Ph.D. (PSY 4254)
Beverly Hills, CA

Stipulated Decision effective January 3, 1997. License Surrender.

Phenix, Amy, Ph.D. (PSY 12730)
Cambria, CA

No admissions to charges of aiding the unlicensed practice of psychology by not having psychological assistant registered. Stipulated Decision effective July 16, 1997. Must take coursework on psychology licensing law, standards of care, and laws and ethics, then Accusation will be withdrawn.

Plotkin, Ronald C., Ph.D. (PSY 9887)
La Mesa, CA

Stipulated Decision effective January 2, 1997. License surrender.

Rick, Gary Richard, Ph.D. (PSY 6296)
Ventura, CA

B&P Code §§2960(f)(n), 810, 650. Admits to committing dishonest, corrupt or fraudulent acts. Respondent illegally paid for patient referrals and committed insurance fraud. Stipulated Decision effective June 21, 1997. License revoked, stayed, 5 years' probation.

Riedlinger, Blaise, Ph.D. (PSY 13030)
Oceanside, CA

B&P Code §2960 (a)(n). Admits to felony convictions for grand theft, defrauding Medi-Cal, and presenting a false insurance claim. Dishonest, corrupt, or fraudulent acts based on underlying conduct in falsely billing Medi-Cal. Stipulated Decision effective June 12, 1997. License revoked, stayed, 30-day suspension, 5 years' probation.

Scully, Richard S., Ph.D. (PSY 15217)
San Francisco, CA

B&P Code §§480(a), 2960(b). In 1986, respondent was convicted of possession with intent to distribute cocaine, and in 1984 was a morphine abuser. Stipulated Decision effective May 28, 1997. Issued license, revoked, stayed, 3 years' probation.

Severance, Donald W., Ph.D. (PSY 8907)
Elk Grove, CA

B&P Code §§2960(j)(o)(r), 726. Committed acts of sexual misconduct, gross negligence, and repeated negligent acts with two patients. Decision effective November 26, 1996. License revoked. *On December 5, 1996, the Order was partially stayed by Superior Court. Respondent can practice at Vacaville Prison with male patients only.*

Did you know?

The Department of Consumer Affairs has, with the help of the Board of Psychology staff and outside experts, updated and revised the acclaimed brochure, Professional Therapy Never Includes Sex. Remember that Section 728 of the Business and Professions Code requires that any psychologist who becomes aware through a patient that the patient had sexual intercourse or sexual contact with a previous psychotherapist during the course of a prior treatment, must provide to the patient the Professional Therapy Never Includes Sex brochure and discuss with the patient the brochure and its contents. For ordering information, see p. 19.

(Continued on page 11)



Disciplinary Actions

(Continued from page 10)

Sortino, David P. (PSB 25270) Graton, CA

B&P Code §§2960(a), 480(c). Failed to disclose misdemeanor convictions on his application for registration as a psychological assistant. Stipulated Decision effective February 27, 1997. Psychological assistant registration denied, stayed, then issued and placed on 5 years' probation.

Speeth, Kathleen, Ph.D. (PSY 5374) Monterey, CA

Stipulated Decision effective June 21, 1997. License surrender.

Spurr, John, Ph.D. (PSY 12450) Santa Cruz, CA

Stipulated Decision effective August 9, 1997. License surrender.

Stockton, Charles T., Ph.D. (PSY 6141) Cypress, CA

B&P Code §§2960(h)(j)(k)(n)(o), 726, 729. Sexual misconduct with a patient.

Decision effective March 26, 1997.

License revoked. *Order stayed by Superior Court on April 22, 1997 pending appeal; Superior Court denied appeal and revocation again became effective July 2, 1997.*

Weiss, Juliet, Ph.D. (PSY 14936) Camarillo, CA

No admissions to charges of practicing without a license. Stipulated Decision effective December 11, 1996. 3-year probationary license granted with terms and conditions.

Wroblewski, Phillip, Ph.D. (PSY 4992) Escondido, CA

No admissions to charges of gross negligence and breach of confidentiality in that respondent revealed information received by a patient during therapy in a letter to the court. Stipulated Decision effective August 29, 1997. License revoked, stayed, 2 years' probation. ♠

Did you know?

If you are preparing to sit for the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP), did you know that 350 items from previous exams (with answers) are available from the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB)? The included exam items span the dimensions of the content outline and are intended to give candidates for licensure a sense of what to expect from the EPPP. For information on cost and how to order, write to ASPPB, P.O. Box 4389, Montgomery, AL 36103.

Record Keeping

(Continued from page 1)

(1993)], as well as the General Guidelines for Providers of Psychological Services published in 1987, are considered guidelines versus mandated actions, they are relevant evidence to establish record keeping as part of the standard of care in the community. In 1997, there is no excuse for failing to keep client records.

Records are helpful for a number of reasons. First, they serve as a reminder to the provider of the important events and issues that took place during a particular session. In this way future work can be more directed and appropriate. Second, they provide documentation of the continuity of care over a designated period. Third, they are helpful to other health care providers who are

providing services concurrently or subsequently. In particular, a client seen years ago may benefit from records of that treatment when new problems develop requiring additional care. Fourth, records are very helpful in a legal dispute with a client, whether it entails fees, time spent in a service category, or an allegation against a psychologist of a breach of the standard of care. Fifth, records assist current and future providers to track progress in treatment of a psychological condition. Sixth, records can be helpful in dealing with audits, including those by the Internal Revenue Service, Medi-Cal, Medi-Care, insurance carriers, or managed care panels. They can be helpful in the defense of an investigation

by the Board of Psychology or other public agency.

One unresolved issue is how long records should be retained. I recommend that records be retained for life. However, no one, including the Board, will hold you to that standard. The APA guidelines recommend retaining a complete copy of the record for three years and a summary for an additional twelve years. This is a very good guideline to follow. Records should be kept at least one year after your client reaches the age of eighteen years.

In the practice of psychology in 1997, it is very important to keep good records. Please do it for yourselves and your clients. ♠



Getting Better All the Time

As a member of the profession of psychology, you have invested considerable time, effort, and other resources in building your practice. Your chosen field also requires that you stay up-to-date with current laws and regulations, seek continuing education, and keep track of developments in the clinical and psychological fields. The Board of Psychology (BOP) respects your dedication, and we hold ourselves to the same high standards.

Regulatory boards face the unique challenge of protecting the health, safety and welfare of consumers while also making every effort to provide service to licensees and those working to become

licensees. Inasmuch as these two goals can at times conflict with each other, the challenge can indeed become quite monumental. With this in mind, the BOP wants to know from you what it has done that you, the public, have found to be valuable, and what it has done which you, the public, think can be done better.

For example, do you find the *BOP Update* to be a worthwhile effort? For those of you who have visited the board's web page, is it worthwhile? For those of you who might have experienced personal presentations from the board members and staff, are these efforts worthwhile? What can the board do to better communicate with the profession and with the

consuming public? The board is asking for your input.

At some point in the near future, please take the time to give us your comments on any topic or issue that you choose. The board and its staff are open to realistic and constructive ways in which the board can do its job better with existing resources. Please take a moment in the coming months to write down your thoughts and ideas and send them to the Board. If you have a quick comment, write it down in the space below and fax it to us at (916) 263-2697; please feel free to use a separate sheet. We look forward to hearing from you.

We Appreciate Your Input.

Did you know?

An Update on Domestic Violence Training

Senate Bill 1995 (O'Connell, Chapter 761) was passed by the Legislature and signed into law by Governor Wilson on September 21, 1996. This bill amended Section 3111 of the California Family Code to state that "on or after January 1, 1998, no person shall be a court-appointed investigator under this chapter unless the person has completed the domestic violence training program described in Section 1816" of the same code. Further, this new legislation states that "the Judicial

Council shall draft a statewide rule of court requiring domestic violence training for all court-appointed persons who evaluate or investigate child custody matters." This requirement, therefore, does not apply to all psychologists, but only to those who serve as court-appointed evaluators or investigators in the Family Court.

On a similar note, subsection (f) was added by the Legislature to Section 2914 of the Business and Professions Code. Section 2914, as you know, states

the licensing requirements for psychologists. Subsection (f) adds a new requirement for those future applicants who began their graduate training on or after January 1, 1995. These applicants must have coursework in spousal or partner abuse assessment, detection, and intervention. This is a one-time course requirement that must be met prior to licensure only by those future applicants who began their graduate training on or after January 1, 1995.



What IS a “Registered Psychologist?”

Most psychology practitioners and consumers of psychological services are aware of two license or registration categories under the jurisdiction of the Board of Psychology: “licensed psychologist” and “registered psychological assistant.” Most are unaware, however, that the board has authority over one other category of registration: “registered psychologist.”

The designation of “registered psychologist” is authorized by Section 2909(d) of the California Business & Professions Code. Just as the psychological assistant registration is intended to be a method by which an unlicensed person can perform limited psychological functions to accrue hours of supervised professional experience, so, too, is the intent of the “registered psychologist” designation. The two practical differences between the registered psychologist and the psychological assistant registrations are (1) qualifications to become registered, and (2) the setting in which the supervised experience occurs.

To become a registered psychologist, one must possess a doctoral degree which qualifies for psychology licensure and at least 1500 hours of qualifying supervised professional experience. To become a psychological assistant, all one needs is a qualifying master’s degree in psychology, with no experience whatsoever required for the registration.

The registered psychologist can be registered only at a nonprofit community agency that receives a minimum of 25% of its funding from some governmental source(s), whereas the psychological assistant is registered to be employed **and** supervised by a licensed psychologist or board-certified psychiatrist in a **private** setting.

You could say that the registered psychologist designation is but one of three ways a person can go about accruing postdoctoral hours of supervised professional experience. In addition to accruing postdoctoral hours as a registered psychologist, one may also accomplish this as a registered psychological assistant in a

private setting or by working in an exempt university or governmental setting such as a Veterans Administration Hospital.

In order for a nonprofit community agency to qualify as an employer of a registered psychologist, it must verify that its funding includes a minimum of 25% from governmental sources other than Medi-Cal/Medi-Care. Further, the agency must have a qualifying supervisor on staff to provide the supervision required in Section 1387 of the Code of Regulations.

The registered psychologist is a two-year, nonrenewable registration. A person may be registered concurrently as a registered psychologist at more than one qualifying nonprofit community agency. ♠

Did you know?

HMO Consumer Complaint Hotline: 1-800-400-0815

In the interest of consumer protection, the Board of Psychology enthusiastically supports the Consumer Complaint Hotline of the Department of Corporations. The Board encourages all licensees to post the hotline number in their offices so that HMO patients are aware of the recourse they may have in dealing with their managed care insurance carrier. A formal complaint may be filed with the Department of Corporations after a patient has attempted all available remedies within the HMO grievance system. HMO personnel who are licensed psychologists must adhere to all ethical principles applicable to the profession, as well as all laws relating to psychology licensure.

What Do Other States Require for Licensure as a Psychologist?

Quite often the Board’s staff is asked this question. Although organizations such as the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) have developed “Model Licensing Acts,” the wide range of varying requirements seen state by state and province by province clearly indicates that by no means is there universal commonality in psychology

licensing requirements across state and provincial lines in the United States and Canada.

The following pages contain information compiled by the ASPPB which clearly outlines the licensing requirements in every U.S. and Canadian jurisdiction. This information is accurate as of March 1997. ♠



Table Synopsis: Licensure Requirements

Education:

All U.S. states and Guam require a doctorate-level degree in psychology or the equivalent to be licensed as a psychologist in their jurisdiction. Only Maine and West Virginia will also accept either a Master's or a doctorate-level degree in psychology or the equivalent. Manitoba and Saskatchewan require a doctorate level degree in psychology or the equivalent.

Experience:

All U.S. states, Guam, and Canadian provinces, with the exception of Indiana and Quebec, require professional experience to obtain a license in their state or province. Quebec and Indiana require no professional experience to obtain a license to practice psychology.

California requires 3,000 hours of supervised professional experience to qualify for licensure, 1,500 of which must be accrued postdoctorally. Twenty-three states, Guam, and two Canadian provinces require the same amount of experience as California. Nineteen states and five Canadian provinces require less experience than California, averaging one

year or 1,500 hours of experience. Seventeen states and no Canadian provinces require more professional experience than California. Of the 17 states that require more experience than California, seven (District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Utah, and Vermont) require a total of 4,000 hours of professional experience to qualify for licensure in their state. Michigan requires the most professional experience to qualify for licensure, with 2,000 hours required predoctorally and 4,000 postdoctorally, for a total of 6,000 hours.

Examinations:

WRITTEN—All U.S. states, Guam, and Canadian provinces require their applicants to take the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) in order to qualify for licensure in their state or province. The EPPP is a national written examination developed and maintained by the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB).

To determine the pass point for the EPPP, 37 states, Guam and three Canadian Provinces (Alberta, Manitoba, and Nova Scotia) use ASPPB's recommended passing score of 70%. With 200 questions on the EPPP, a 70% score equals 140 out of 200 correct. Two Canadian provinces (British Columbia and New Brunswick) use a passing score of 65% (130 out of 200 correct), and Quebec has a passing score of 60% (120 out of 200 correct). Fourteen states (Indiana, Michigan, Maryland, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and the District of Columbia) use different methods in determining the passing score

for each administration of the EPPP. The most popular method is 1/2 standard deviation below the national mean. The national mean is determined by the number of candidates divided by the average score for each administration of the EPPP. The mean will be different for each administration of the EPPP. Michigan and South Dakota use one standard deviation below the mean; Wyoming, New Mexico, and New Hampshire use the mean as the pass point.

ORAL—California requires every applicant for licensure to take an oral examination in addition to the EPPP. California's oral examination covers eight areas of professional practice: Assessment and Evaluation; Diagnosis; Treatment Planning and Implementation; Crisis Evaluation and Intervention; Legal Mandates and Related Issues; Professional Ethics; Limitations and Judgment; and Human Diversity. If a California applicant is licensed in another state for three or more years with no discipline on that license, or was previously licensed in California and allowed the license to expire, or is a Diplomate of the American Board of Professional Psychologists, the applicant then qualifies to take an oral examination that covers California law and professional ethics only.

Most states, Guam, and Canadian provinces require a comprehensive, ethics or jurisprudence oral examination to obtain a licensure in their state or province. Only the District of Columbia, 15 states (Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, and Wyoming), and one province (Newfoundland) do not require any type of oral examination to obtain a license to practice psychology. ♠

Did you know?

**The Board of Psychology
is now on the internet!**

www.dca.ca.gov/psych

*The website contains all BOP
publications and frequent updates,
as well as links to related websites.*



Licensure Requirements For U.S. States and Canadian Provinces as of March 1997

State or Canadian Province	EDUCATION		EXPERIENCE	WRITTEN EXAM			ORAL EXAM		
	Doctorate	Master's		EPPP*/ Pass Score	Other	None	(Other)	Yes (Clinical)	Yes None
Alabama	x		1500 hrs	X/70%			Ethics		
Alaska	x		1yr post-doc	X/70%			Law/Ethics		
Alberta		x	1600 hrs	X/70%				x	
Arizona	x		3000 hrs	X/70%				x	
Arkansas	x		2000 hrs post	X/70%				x	
British Columbia	x		1yr (1600hrs)	X/65%				x	
California	x		3000 hrs	X/70%			Jurisprudence/Ethics	x	
Colorado	x		12 months	X/70%			Jurisprudence		
Connecticut	x		1yr pre, 1yr post	X/70%			Jurisprudence		
Delaware	x		3000 hrs post	X/70%					x
District of Columbia	x		4000 hrs post	X/1/2 SD below mean			Jurisprudence		
Florida	x		4000 hrs	X/70%	Jurisprudence				x
Georgia	x		2000 hrs pre 2000 hrs post	X/70%Juris			x		
Guam	x		1yr pre, 1yr post	X/70%					x
Hawaii	x		1900 hrs pre 1900 hrs post	X/70%			Jurisprudence		
Idaho	x		2000 hrs	X/70%					x
Illinois	x		2500 hrs	X/70%					x
Indiana	x		None	X/1/2 SD below mean	Jurisprudence		Jurisprudence		
Iowa	x		1yr pre, 1yr post	X/70%				x	
Kansas	x		1800 hrs pre 1800 hrs post	X/70%					x
Kentucky	x		4000 hrs	X/70%				x	
Louisiana	x		4000 hrs	X/70%				x	
Maine	72 credits	x	2 yrs	X/70%				x	
Manitoba	x		1yr pre, 1yr post	X/70%				x	
Maryland	x		1yr pre, 1yr post	X/73%			Jurisprudence		
Massachusetts	x		3200 hrs	X/70%			Jurisprudence		
Michigan	x		2000 hrs pre 4000 hrs post	X/1 SD below mean					x
Minnesota	x		24 months	X/70%	Jurisprudence				x
Mississippi	x		1yr (2000 hrs)	X/1/2 SD below mean				x	
Missouri	x		1500 hrs	X/70%	Jurisprudence			x	
Montana	x		1yr pre, 1yr post	X/70%				x	

(Continued on page 16)



(Continued from page 15)

State or Canadian Province	EDUCATION		EXPERIENCE	WRITTEN EXAM			ORAL EXAM		
	Doctorate	Master's		EPPP*/ Pass Score	Other	None	(Other)	Yes (Clinical)	Yes None
Nebraska	x		1 yr post & Clin. internship	X/70%	Jurisprudence				
Nevada	x		2 yrs (3500 hrs)	X/70%				x	
New Brunswick	x	x	Doct: 1 yr post MA: 4 yrs	X/65%				x	
New Hampshire	x		1 yr pre, 1yr post	X/Mean					
New Jersey	x		1750 hrs pre 1750 hrs post	X/70%				x	
New Mexico	x		1yr pre, 3500 post	X/Mean				x	
New York	x		2 years	X/CR Angoff					x
Newfoundland	x	x	Doct: 1 yr MA: 2 yr	X					x
North Carolina	x		1 yr pre, 1 yr post	X/70%	Jurisprudence				x
North Dakota	x		1 yr	X/1/4 SD below mean			Jurisprudence /Ethics		
Nova Scotia	x	x	Doct: 2 yr MA: 6 yr	X/65%			Ethics		
Ohio		x	1 yr pre, 1 yr post	X/70%				x	
Oklahoma	x		2 yrs	X/70%	Jurisprudence			x	
Ontario	x		1 yr (1500 hrs)	X/70%			Jurisprudence		
Oregon	x		1 yr pre, 1 yr post	X/70%				x	
Pennsylvania	x		1 yr pre, 1 yr post (3000 hrs)	X/CR Angoff	Jurisprudence				x
Quebec		x	None	X/60%				x	
Rhode Island	x		1 yr, pre, 1 yr post	X/70%				x	
Saskatchewan	x		1 yr post-doc	X/70%				x	
South Carolina	x		1 yr pre, 1 yr post	X/70%				x	
South Dakota	x		1800 pre 1 yr post	X/1 SD below mean				x	
Tennessee	x		1 yr pre, 1 yr post	X/70%				x	
Texas	x		1 yr pre, 1 yr post	X/70%	Jurisprudence			x	
Utah	x		4000 hrs	X/70%	Jurisprudence				x
Vermont	x		4000 hrs	X/1/2 SD below mean					x
Virginia	x		1 yr for clinical	X/70%	Jurisprudence	Practical			x
Washington	x		1500 hrs pre 1500 hrs post	X/70%				x	
West Virginia	x	x	Doct: 2 yrs MA: 5 yrs	X/1/2 SD below mean			x		
Wisconsin	x		3000 hrs	X/70%	Jurisprudence		Interview		
Wyoming	x		2000 hrs pre 1500 hrs post	X/Mean					x

*Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology. National written examination developed, maintained and owned by the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards.



BOP Publications

You no longer need to speak to a live person to request printed materials from the BOP. Our computer phone system is equipped to take requests for most of the Board's publications. To make such a request, simply call (916) 263-2699 and follow the computer's instructions to record your name, address, and the publications you need.

If you are ordering the *Laws & Regulations . . .*, please send your written request with a check for \$4 made out to the Board of Psychology, 1422 Howe Avenue, Suite 22, Sacramento CA 95825.

<i>Laws & Regulations Relating to the Practice of Psychology</i>	\$4
<i>Board of Psychology Disciplinary Guidelines</i>	Free
<i>All About the California Board of Psychology</i>	Free
<i>Do You Have a Complaint?</i>	Free
<i>Everybody Has Problems</i>	Free
<i>Professional Therapy Never Includes Sex</i>	
Single copies	Free
Licensees may order in bulk from the Department of General Services.	
Cost is 40 cents each, or packages of 25 for \$10 each. Call or write to	
BOP for an order form. Brochure is also available in Spanish.	
<i>Spectrum of Administrative Actions</i>	
<i>Available to the Board of Psychology</i>	Free
<i>Continuing Education Brochure</i>	Free

Board of Psychology

1422 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 22
SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3200
(916) 263-2699

BOP ONLINE: www.dca.ca.gov/psych

BOARD MEMBERS

Bruce Ebert, PhD, JD
Chairperson
Judith Janaro Fabian, PhD
Vice-Chairperson
Martin Greenberg, PhD
Linda Hee, PhD
Lilli Friedland, PhD
Marilyn Palarea
Mary McMillan
Mary Ellen Early

STAFF MEMBERS

Thomas O'Connor, Executive Officer
Suzanne Taylor, Enforcement Coordinator
Jeffrey Thomas, Enforcement Analyst
Karen Johnson, Licensing and Examination Coordinator
Jeane Ward, Licensing Analyst
Richard Hodgkin, Licensing Analyst
Kathi Burns, Enforcement Technician
Gia Munguia, Office Technician
Wanda Hawkins,
Continuing Education Technician
Annette Brown,
Internal Business Services Technician
Mary Armstrong,
Psychological Assistant Clerk

Put BOP's Phone System to Work for You



The Board receives an average of nearly 500 telephone calls per day! This is obviously far more calls than the few staff persons can personally handle. If you do need to speak with a specific staff person, chances are, the person you need to speak to is already on his/her line helping another applicant, licensee, or other member of the public. If this is the case, you will be sent directly to his/her voice-mail.

LEAVE A MESSAGE with your name and phone number, and the staff person with whom you need to speak will attempt to call you back within 24 hours.

If you don't leave a message, we can't call you back. Put voice mail to work for you! Please call (916) 263-2699.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY
1422 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 22
SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3200

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
SACRAMENTO, CA
PERMIT NO. 685

1998 Board Meeting & Examination Calendar

DATE	EVENT	LOCATION
January 10	Oral Examination	Los Angeles
January 17	Oral Examination	Northern CA
February 20	Item Writer's Workshop	Northern CA
February 26 - March 1	ASPPB Mid-Winter Meeting	Long Beach
March 6 & 7	Board Meeting	San Diego
March 26 - 29	CPA Annual Meeting	Pasadena
March 27	Expert Training	Pasadena
April 8	Written Examination	Northern CA Southern CA
May 15 & 16	Board Meeting	Los Angeles
June 20	Oral Examination	Los Angeles
June 27	Oral Examination	San Francisco
July 17	Item Writer's Workshop	Los Angeles
August 14 - 18	APA Annual Meeting	San Francisco
August 19 & 20 (Tentative)	Board Meeting	San Francisco
October 14 - 18	ASPPB Annual Meeting	Norfolk, VA
October 21	Written Examination	Northern CA Southern CA
November 13 & 14	Board Meeting	San Diego

***The Board of
Psychology is
committed to the
protection of the
health, safety, and
welfare of consumers
of psychological
services.***

